

1	WE, THE JURY in the above-entitled action, unanimously find as follows or		
2	the questions submitted to us:		
3			
4	ROBINSON-P	ATMAN ACT CLAIM	
5			
6	1. Did any Plaintiff prove that the	Defendants violated the F	Robinson-Patman
7	Act? (Instruction No. 17).		
8			
9	AKR	Yes	No
10	Border Cash & Carry	Yes	No
11	Excel Wholesale	Yes	No
12	L.A. International	Yes	No
13	L.A. Top Distributor	Yes	No
14	Manhattan Wholesalers	Yes	No
15	PITCO	Yes	No
16	U.S. Wholesale	Yes	No
17	Value Distributor	Yes	No
18			
19	If your answer to Question No. 1 is "I	Yes" for any Plaintiff, pled	ase answer Question
20	No. 2 as to that Plaintiff only.		
21	If your answer to Question No. 1 is "I	No'' for all Plaintiffs, plea	se answer Question
22	No. 7.		
23			
24	2. Did the Defendants prove	e, as to any Plaintiff, that	the differences in
25	price for Clear Eyes given to Costco I	Business Center and Sam's	s Club were to meet
26	the price of the Defendants' competito	or? (Instruction No. 24).	
27			/
28	AKR	Yes	No
- 1		1	

Case 2	2:18-cv-06809-MWF-MRW Document 329 #:28546	Filed 12/15/23 Pa	age 3 of 8 Page ID		
1					
	Border Cash & Carry	Yes	No		
2	Excel Wholesale	Yes	No		
3	L.A. International	Yes	No		
4	L.A. Top Distributor	Yes	No		
5	Manhattan Wholesalers	Yes	No		
6	PITCO	Yes	No		
7	U.S. Wholesale	Yes	No		
8	Value Distributor	Yes	No		
9					
10	If your answer to Question No. 2 is "Yes'	' for all Plaintiffs, pl	ease answer Question		
11					
12	lacksquare				
13	No. 3 as to that Plaintiff only.	33.1	~		
14					
15	3. Did the Defendants prove, as	s to any Plaintiff, tha	t the difference in		
16	_				
17	price for Clear Eyes given to Costco Business Center and Sam's Club v by cost differences? (Instruction No. 25).				
18	by cost differences: (Instruction 140, 23).				
19	AKR	Yes	✓ No		
20	Border Cash & Carry	Yes	✓ No		
21	Excel Wholesale	Yes	√ No		
22					
23	L.A. International	Yes			
24	L.A. Top Distributor	Yes	No		
25	Manhattan Wholesalers	Yes	No		
26	PITCO	Yes	No		
27	U.S. Wholesale	Yes	No		
28	Value Distributor	Yes	No		
	•				

Document 329

Filed 12/15/23

Page 4 of 8 Page ID

Case 2:18-cv-06809-MWF-MRW

· Case 2	2:18-cv-06809-MWF-MRW Document 329 #:28548	Filed 12/	15/23 Page 5	of 8 Page ID
1				
2	AKR	•	Yes	No
3	Border Cash & Carry		Yes	No
4	Excel Wholesale		Yes	No
5	L.A. International		Yes	No
6	L.A. Top Distributor		Yes	No
7	Manhattan Wholesalers		Yes	No
8	PITCO		Yes	No
9	U.S. Wholesale		Yes	No
10	Value Distributor		Yes	No No
11	•			
Regardless of your answer, please answer Question No. 6.				
13				
14	6. What amount of damages did each Plaintiff prove for the Defendan			41 D. C
* '	o. What amount of damages di	u cacii r iai	num prove for	the Defendants
15	violation of the Robinson-Patman Act? (		-	the Defendants
	C		-	the Defendants
15	C		-	the Defendants
15 16	violation of the Robinson-Patman Act? (	Instruction	No. 28).	the Defendants
15 16 17	violation of the Robinson-Patman Act? (  AKR	Instruction \$	No. 28).	the Defendants
15 16 17 18	violation of the Robinson-Patman Act? (  AKR  Border Cash & Carry	#	No. 28).	the Defendants
15 16 17 18 19	violation of the Robinson-Patman Act? (  AKR  Border Cash & Carry  Excel Wholesale	\$ \$ \$ \$	No. 28).	the Defendants
15 16 17 18 19 20	violation of the Robinson-Patman Act? (  AKR  Border Cash & Carry  Excel Wholesale  L.A. International	\$ \$ \$ \$	No. 28).  25,000  p  25,000  95,000	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	violation of the Robinson-Patman Act? (  AKR  Border Cash & Carry  Excel Wholesale  L.A. International  L.A. Top Distributor	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$	No. 28).  25,000  p  25,000  95,000  25,000	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	violation of the Robinson-Patman Act? (  AKR  Border Cash & Carry  Excel Wholesale  L.A. International  L.A. Top Distributor  Manhattan Wholesalers	\$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$	No. 28).  25,000  95,000  25,000  25,000	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	violation of the Robinson-Patman Act? (  AKR  Border Cash & Carry  Excel Wholesale  L.A. International  L.A. Top Distributor  Manhattan Wholesalers  Pitco	\$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$	No. 28).  25,000  95,000  25,000  25,000  30,000	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	violation of the Robinson-Patman Act? (  AKR  Border Cash & Carry  Excel Wholesale  L.A. International  L.A. Top Distributor  Manhattan Wholesalers  Pitco  U.S. Wholesale	\$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$	No. 28).  25,000  95,000  25,000  25,000  30,000  75,000	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	violation of the Robinson-Patman Act? (  AKR  Border Cash & Carry  Excel Wholesale  L.A. International  L.A. Top Distributor  Manhattan Wholesalers  Pitco  U.S. Wholesale	\$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$	No. 28).  25,000  95,000  25,000  25,000  30,000  75,000	

- 4 -

## **CALIFORNIA UNFAIR PRACTICES ACT CLAIM**

1	CALIFORNIA UNFAIR PRACTICES ACT CLAIM		
2			
3	7. Did any Plaintiff prove that the Defendants violated the California		
4	Unfair Practices Act? (Instruction No. 33).		
5			
6	L.A. International	Yes	No
7	L.A. Top Distributor	Yes	No
8	PITCO	Yes	No
9	U.S. Wholesale	Yes	No
10	Value Distributor	Yes	No
11			
12	If your answer to Question No. 7 is "I	es" for any Plaintiff, ple	ease answer Question
13	No. 8 as to that Plaintiff only.		
14	If your answer to Question No. 7 is "No" for all Plaintiffs, please sign and return		
15	this form.		
16			
17	8. Did the Defendants prove that the secret rebates were lawful because		
18	they applied to different classes of cust	comers? (Instruction No.	34).
19	L.A. International	Yes	✓ No
20	L.A. Top Distributor	Yes	✓ No
21	PITCO	Yes	─────────────────────────────────────
22	U.S. Wholesale	Yes	✓ No
23	Value Distributor	Yes	No
24	Variation Distribution	105	
25	If your answer to Question No. 8 is "Y	Ves" for all Plaintiffs nla	pase sion and return
26	this form.	joi am 1 iminigjs, pre	moe bigii ana remin
27	If your answer to Question No. 8 is "N	No" for any Plaintiff pla	ase answer Ouestion
28	Jyour answer to Question 110.0 is 1	to joi any i taming, pre	ase answer Question

* Case	2:18-cv-06809-MWF-MRW	Document 329 #:28550	Filed 12/15/23	Page 7 of 8	Page ID
1	No. 9 as to that Plaintiff	only.			
2					
3	9. Did the Def	endants prove tha	nt the secret rebat	tes were lawf	al because
4	they were justified by a g	good-faith attemp	t to meet compet	tition? (Instru	iction Nos.
5	35–36).				
6					,
7	L.A. International		Yes		_No
8	L.A. Top Distribu	ntor	Yes		_No
9	PITCO		Yes		_No
10	U.S. Wholesale		Yes		No
11	Value Distributor		Yes		_No
12					
13	Regardless of your answe	er, please answer	Question No. 10	0.	
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

10. What ar	nount of damages did each Plaintiff prove for the Defendants'
violations of the Cal	fornia Unfair Practices Act? (Instruction Nos. 37–38). (You
should answer this q	uestion without regard to any damages that you may have
awarded in response	to Question No. 6. If necessary, the Court will ensure that no
double-counting take	es place.)

L.A. International

PITCO

U.S. Wholesale

L.A. Top Distributor

Value Distributor

\$ 90	1000

\$ 30,000

5,000

\$ 130,000

Please sign and return this verdict form.

Dated: 1215 2023

Signed: NAME REDACTED BY THE COURT

Foreperson